



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ANTECEDENTS OF HELLENISTIC COMEDY

BY HENRY W. PRESCOTT

The possibility, which I have briefly indicated (*CP*, XI, 127 ff.), that certain features of Roman comedy regarded by modern critics as inartistic and Roman in origin were inherent in the Greek originals necessitates a review of the evidence upon which this modern criticism bases its presupposition that Hellenistic comedy is the issue of a great *Kunstentwicklung* in which Euripides was the initiating and controlling force. In such a review I must be content, without pretentious bibliography or detailed analysis, to consider the broad foundations of this theory; the critical question which I have to answer is, how far the interpretation of the technique of Roman comedy must be influenced and determined by known facts regarding the development of the form of comedy in earlier stages of its history.

The study of literary genesis in classical literature seldom leads to convincing conclusions. There are usually tremendous gaps in the evidence. And in the case of comedy, particularly, the disadvantage of fragmentary evidence is increased if one admits, as I must, that whatever validity is attached in general to evolutionary development in literature, comedy is peculiarly exposed, as originally an informal popular entertainment and even in its more artistic form ever *en rapport* with the audience, to influences which promote spontaneous generation and encourage the creation of what the biologists call sports. There is great danger in taking comedy too seriously. The problem forced upon me by the modern interpretation of Roman comedy I should be glad to dismiss in the words which Mother Jaguar addressed to her son when he found difficulty in discriminating two new animals in the woods which, like Euripidean tragedy and Hellenistic comedy, seemed to have lost distinguishing traits by a process of exchange and merger: ". . . the one you said couldn't swim, swims, and the one you said couldn't curl up, curls; and they've gone shares in their prickles, I think. . . . " "Son, son," said Mother Jaguar, ever so many times graciously

waving her tail, "a Hedgehog is a Hedgehog, and can't be anything but a Hedgehog; and a Tortoise is a Tortoise, and can never be anything else." "But it isn't a Hedgehog, and it isn't a Tortoise. It's a little bit of both, and I don't know its proper name." "Nonsense," said Mother Jaguar, "everything has its proper name. I should call it 'Armadillo' till I found out the real one. And I should leave it alone."

I

Mother Jaguar's first contention is practically identical with the view of ancient theorists who, in various Greek documents dating in their present form from the eighth to the fifteenth century A.D., derive Hellenistic comedy from the Old comedy of the fifth century.¹ To them comedy is comedy. The general insistence of ancient literary theory upon comedy and tragedy as independent entities may have blinded these critics to the discovery of modern scholars that this later comedy is not comedy, but merely Euripidean tragedy with comic appurtenances. In any case there are reasons for rejecting the ancient theory, at least in so far as it represents Greek comedy throughout its entire history as primarily devoted to abusive criticism of men and affairs, and as changing the objects and the form of its criticism under the influence of external conditions, political or economic.

Democracy encourages an extreme form of *λοιδορία*; oligarchy represses open criticism. So far as it covers only the Old and the Middle periods of Greek comedy, the political environment of the two periods supports the relative validity of the theory up to this point, even if one finds violent criticism in fragments of Middle comedy and observes that orators of the fourth century are apparently immune in attacking men prominent in public life. But the absurdity of the theory becomes apparent when, as may have been the case, a rigid systematizing led to the extension of this simple political formula in order to cover, consistently with the controlling idea, the different form and content of New comedy; for then the

¹ Kaibel, *Comic. Gr. Frag.*, I, 3 ff. contains the text of these documents. References to Kaibel, without further definition, are to the pages and the marginal numbering of lines of this edition. For a critical study of sources, cf. Kaibel, "Die Prolegomena ΠΕΡΙ ΚΩΜΩΔΙΑΣ," *Abhandl. götting. Gesell.*, II/4 (1898).

ancient critics were driven to the extreme contention that in New comedy abusive attack was directed against slaves and foreigners. It is quite evident from the remains of New comedy and from the Roman adaptations that the poets of this later period were innocent of any malicious designs upon slaves and foreigners; the political systematizer has selected these two categories out of the many characters represented in the plays of New comedy, because they furnish a direct antithesis to the rich freemen and influential citizens who, according to the same theory, were subjected to violent criticism in Old comedy. At this point, therefore, ancient critics become purely rhetorical. One may, however, still insist on the plausibility of the general notion if it is limited to Old and Middle comedy, and may regard the weakness as mere botching, by some later hand, of a theory that was reasonable when first presented, perhaps in the course of the fourth century, as an explanation of the differences between Old and Middle comedy.¹

By this shift from explicit criticism to veiled attack and innuendo ancient theory accounts for essential changes in content; development in form it relates particularly to the gradual elimination of the chorus. The statement of the case in Platonius² is blurred and inaccurate. He mentions the defect of *choregoi* and the consequent omission of parabases and *chorika mele* in close connection with his statement of the limitations of free speech under an oligarchy. A clearer statement of the case, in accord with probability, might explicitly relate the diminished importance of the chorus to this suppression of frank criticism, for the chorus as the main instrument in the expression of lampooning attacks on individuals and public policies would necessarily lose its function so soon as outspoken criticism was checked, and would ultimately disappear unless it could acquire a new and equally essential function. But Platonius leaves this important consideration implicit in the context and explicitly refers the diminished rôle of the chorus to financial exigency, resulting apparently from the Peloponnesian War. Consistently, in point of date, he mentions as an example of comedies produced under these conditions the *Aiolosikon* of Aristophanes,

¹ Kaibel, "Die Prolegomena," 48 ff.

² Kaibel, 4/21 ff., and repeated in different form 5/45 ff.

and inaccurately includes, as if of the same date, a mythological travesty by Cratinus, the *Odusses*, which was probably exhibited as early as 440-38; and he explicitly refers this shift from lampooning comedy to mythological travesty, in respect to content as well as to form, to the necessity of diverting criticism from men and affairs to literary material as found in mythological tragedy. A mythological travesty without parabases and *chorika* he represents to be typical of Middle comedy.¹

In my opinion this part of Platonius' statement is a plausible theory, if one revises the form of his expression in accord with known facts and conceivable conditions, correcting his obvious error and emphasizing what he left implicit. Such a revised statement might run thus: Old comedy in the fifth century was devoted mainly to satirical criticism of prominent men. At intervals and temporarily from the middle of the fifth century on this outspoken criticism was checked;² on such occasions the playwrights often resorted to mythological travesty, and the chorus, as the main instrument of satirical attack, dropped into the background. At the turn of the fifth century, when free speech was more effectually suppressed, these mythological comedies, approximately chorusless, emerged as the dominant type of comedy; so that what was occasional and temporary in the case of Cratinus' *Odusses* became normal in the later years of Aristophanes' career and in the productions of Plato and of the earlier poets of the Middle period. That a more reasonable exposition of the theory once existed in Greek documents is suggested by the form which it assumes in Latin documents presumably Greek in origin. A more explicit statement of the case for the chorus, for example, is made by Horace (*A. P.* 283): "chorusque turpiter obtineuit sublato iure nocendi." And the theory in the large appears

¹ It is not clear that Platonius intended to indicate the complete removal of the chorus from the plays that he regards as anticipating the Middle comedy; for some mythological plays the chorus seems to be well authenticated, and for its retention in the Middle period cf. Capps, *AJA*, X (1895), 303 ff.; *Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc.*, XXXI (1900), 133; Koerte, *N. JHBB. f. d. kl. Alt.*, V (1900), 81 ff.

² The extent of this repression in the fifth century, the legal procedure involved, the particular kind of criticism prohibited by the legal procedure, are all matters of dispute; for discussion and full bibliography cf. Kalinka, *Die Pseudozenophontische ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ*, pp. 7 ff., and his commentary on II. 18; also Starkie, in his edition of the *Acharnians*, excursus II, pp. 243 f.

in a more rational form in the Latin versions of Evanthius,¹ Diomedes,² and the *Liber Glossarum*.³ Here the absurdity of slaves and foreigners as objects of attack in New comedy is replaced by more discreet generalizations in which New comedy is described as a portrayal of private life devoid of malicious criticism.

II

Acceptable as this revised version of the ancient theory might be, it would have only the validity of partial truth; for it is demonstrable that the exponents of this theory not only committed errors, but omitted an essential amount of evidence that might well have contributed to an understanding of the transition from Old to Middle comedy. For in many of the Greek documents, with remarkable consistency, the individual poets who serve as illustrations of the normal type of comedy in the Old period are Cratinus, Eupolis, and Aristophanes—these three and no more.⁴ The concentration upon this famous triad of scurrilous poets is much earlier than the Greek documents in question; for the phrasing in passages of Horace,⁵ Quintilian,⁶ and Velleius⁷ clearly indicates that these three poets had come to stand quite exclusively as representative of Old comedy, at least as early as the first century B.C.

We have, however, unassailable evidence that there existed in the fifth century, quite apart from these and other scurrilous poets, a distinct type of comedy differing in form and content from the scurrilous plays usually cultivated by this triad of poets. Aristotle, in his *Poetics* (1449b), having previously stated the successive changes in tragedy, professes ignorance of corresponding changes in comedy. Comedy was informal; it was officially recognized only late in its development and had already assumed definite form at the time when individual poets were recorded in the official reports of dramatic contests. In the midst of this frank confession of ignorance, however, Aristotle asserts positively that the invention of plots originated in

¹ Kaibel, 64/66 ff.

² *Ibid.*, 58/166 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, 72/15 ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 3/3, 3/12, 6/73-90, 15/70, 58/165, 62/23; also Ps. Dionys. *Ars rhet.* 57.19 Usener; cf. Kroehnert, *Canonesne poet. script. artif.* . . . fuerint, Königsberg (1897), 27.

⁵ *Serm.* i. 4. 1; cf. Persius i. 123 ff.

⁶ x. 1. 66.

⁷ i. 16. 3.

Sicily and was introduced into Athens by Crates, who was the first of the Athenians to abandon scurrilous comedy and to generalize themes or plots.¹ There can, I think, be no reasonable doubt that Aristotle in this passage is conscious of the antithesis between the comedy of his own day and the Old comedy. The general context indicates a close relation between the iambographs and the poets of Old comedy, who have in common the *ιαμβικὴ ἰδέα* and *λοιδορία*. To Aristotle the generalized comedy of his own day is opposed and superior to this scurrilous comedy (cf. *Poet.* 1451b; *Eth. Nic.* 1128a. 22), and by implication he is finding in Epicharmus and Crates the earlier background of the generalizing tendencies of Hellenistic comedy and its unity of plot as contrasted with the incoherent satirical burlesque usually cultivated by poets of the Old comedy. The great difficulty lies in our determining from such a general statement and from fragmentary evidence of the content and form both of Sicilian comedy and its issues in the hands of Crates and Pherecrates² just what progress, if any, had been made near the middle of the fifth century toward either the non-scurrilous mythological travesty of the Middle period or the well-organized comedy of manners that we find ultimately in the Roman adaptations of Greek models, most of which were probably post-Aristotelian in date.

From the tantalizing array of titles and fragments of Epicharmus' plays³ one fact immediately emerges: more than half of the thirty-six extant titles point to mythological themes. It is, of course, a negative fact of doubtful significance that the fragments contain no evidence of scurrilous attacks on individuals, but the Doric farce

¹ τὸ δὲ μῦθους ποιεῖν Ἐπίχαρμος καὶ Φόρμυς· τὸ μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐκ Σικελίας ἦλθε· τῶν δὲ Ἀθηναίων Κράτης πρῶτος ἤρξεν ἀφέμενος τῆς ἰαμβικῆς ἰδέας καθόλου ποιεῖν λόγους καὶ μῦθους. (Cf. Themistius *Or.* 27. p. 406 Dind.) Changes proposed in the text of Aristotle do not affect the passage for our purposes. On the interpretation of λόγους καὶ μῦθους cf. Vahlen, *Sitzb. d. kais. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Wien* (phil.-hist. Cl.), L (1865), 295-98; and for a summary of various modern interpretations of the passage cf. Behaghel, *Gesch. d. Auffassung d. aristoph. Vögel*, II, 6, n. 2.

² An anonymous treatise on the poets of comedy, after characterizing Crates, says of Pherecrates (Kaibel 8/33): . . . ἐξήλωκε Κράτητα καὶ αὐτοῦ μὲν λοιδορεῖν ἀπέστη, πράγματα δὲ εἰσηγούμενος καὶ νῦν δοκίμει, γενόμενος εὐρετικὸς μύθων.

³ The extreme skepticism regarding Epicharmus and his work (Wilamowitz, *Textg. d. gr. Lyriker*, 24 ff.; *GGA* [1906], 621 ff.; Fraenkel, *de med. et nov. com. gr. quaest. sel.* [Göttingen, 1912], 78, n. 1) seems to me quite unwarranted; cf. Körte, *Burs.-Jahresb.*, CLII (1911), 231.

from which Sicilian comedy is supposed to develop and the political environment of Epicharmus do not provide a background for lampooning comedy such as Athens cultivated in the atmosphere of the carnival-*komos*.¹ It is quite possible that to Athenians of Crates' time the mythological plays of Epicharmus furnished a sharp antithesis to the lampooning burlesques of Cratinus. And not only in content but in form; for mythological themes, whether derived from oral tradition, epic poetry, or tragedy, have already been organized for the comic poet, in earlier popular or literary tradition, with a degree of coherence and unity that would stand in striking contrast with the inorganic satirical drama of Athens in the fifth century. In brief, the conditions provide for a direct line of descent from the mythological plays of Epicharmus through occasional Athenian vagaries like the *Odusses* of Cratinus to the mythological travesty that dominated the comic stage at Athens in the later days of Aristophanes and in the time of Plato and his immediate successors. And not only the relative coherence of mythological plot, but the absence of a chorus from the plays of Epicharmus, so far as the fragments negatively attest, provide the requisite background for both the chorusless Hellenistic type and for an intermediate form in which a chorus, relatively inactive, perhaps appeared with an entrance song, but denied itself parabasis and regularly recurring *chorika mele*, as Platonius seems to assert and as the present text of the *Plutus*² may serve to illustrate. Such an intermediate form may have been a compromise between the Sicilian and the normal Attic form of comedy, leading the way to a chorusless type of play in the New, if not in the Middle, period.

But, although known facts and conditions could be harmonized with such a theory of historical continuity in the development of a

¹ Non-scurrilous comedy, in the sense in which I use the term, does not necessarily avoid satirical attacks upon social and political groups or implicit attacks on individuals, but does eliminate explicit lampooning of governmental policies and individuals, particularly those prominent in public life. So, for example, Epicharmus may attack the soothsayers (frag. 9, cf. Rhinthon frag. 17 Kaibel), and even in Sicilian mime, under the direction of the tyrant Dionysius, Xenarchus may lampoon the citizens of Rhegium (Xenarchus frag. 2 Kaibel). Similar attacks upon social and political groups frequently recur in Hellenistic comedy.

² On the *Plutus* as a "neoterizing" comedy, cf. *Vita Aristoph.* (Van Leeuwen, *Proleg. ad Aristoph.*, p. 173) and the critical apparatus of Kaibel 18/30.

non-scurrilous mythological comedy, it would be difficult from extant evidence to resolve plausible theory into incontestable fact. And even if mythological comedy in the Middle period were satisfactorily accounted for by such reasoning, a coherent comedy of manners, sentiment, and intrigue such as emerges in the Middle period and becomes dominant in the New period would still remain unexplained. Of course, as a mere statement of possibility, it is reasonable to assert that mythological comedy offers an opening for the development out of itself of a comedy of manners, sentiment, and intrigue; for the travesty of the gods and heroes of myth is most easily effected by reducing these supernatural beings to the level of ordinary human creatures and by subjecting them to the experiences of everyday life; mythological comedy had probably anticipated Euripides in humanizing gods and heroes.¹ Yet the development of a comedy of manners from such a source would seem somewhat forced and roundabout if the rudiments of a comedy of manners existed in the germs which, transferred to Sicily and Southern Italy from the Peloponnesus, Epicharmus and others may have developed in his artistic rehabilitation of earlier Dorian elements. It should, however, be expressly stated that any attempt to reconstruct a comedy of manners from what we know of Epicharmus, Crates, and Pherecrates is bound to result merely in the accumulation of a number of facts, each weak in itself, and many of them resting upon somewhat dubious hypotheses. The difficulty of differentiating the character-

¹ Mythological comedy may of course be political, as Cratinus' *Dionusalexandros*, *Nemesis*, and *Drapetides* attest, but in such cases innuendo rather than explicit attack seems to have been the rule; and general social satire was always available in mythological comedy. On the other hand, Plautus' *Amphitruo* may suggest how easily a mythological comedy approaches a comedy of manners, and how fully some myths provide the essential themes of intrigue, sentiment, confusion of identity. It is probable that mythological comedy provided a rich variety of form and content. The handling of the myth in Cratinus' *Dionusalexandros*, as we now know from the hypothesis, illustrates the comical perversion of the story, while the *Amphitruo* shows how closely the travesty may keep to the myth, expanding simply the theme of confused identity. And as regards form, though the chorus in Athenian mythological comedy may have been relatively inactive in some cases, yet it seems to have maintained its function in other cases, as the hypothesis of the *Dionusalexandros*, again, perhaps attests. In brief, though I think I may safely refer to mythological comedy as non-scurrilous in the Aristotelian sense, I do not intend to ascribe any uniformity in content or form to the type; it furnished an opportunity for mitigating or avoiding personal attack. A complete and orderly synthesis of the attainable facts regarding the form and content of mythological comedy is much desired.

istics of Sicilian comedy in general is due, not merely to the scantiness of material evidence, but to the fact that Sicilian comedy and Attic comedy, in the opinion of many modern scholars, were both dependent upon Doric farce, the former being an embellished form of Doric farce, the latter a combination of Doric farce with an indigenous Attic element, the *komos*-chorus. If these modern views are correct, even Aristophanic comedy is likely to reveal some features that appeared in the plays of Epicharmus;¹ and if we are searching for a non-scurrilous type of Old Attic comedy that existed before and alongside of Aristophanic comedy, but distinct from most of it in form and content, it becomes peculiarly hazardous to stress the broad characteristics of Doric farce as possibly continued through Epicharmus, Crates, and Pherecrates to the time of the Middle comedy and later. Only the precise statement of Aristotle leads me, with this admission of the difficulty and the hazard, to emphasize in the evidence of Doric farce, of Epicharmus, and of Crates and Pherecrates those features which conceivably might foreshadow distinguishing traits of a comedy of manners in the Middle period.

Doric farce in the Peloponnesus may well have been hardly more than a loosely connected series of scenes, a compromise between mime and drama.² The statement in Athenaeus 621d, on the authority of Sosibius, regarding an early Spartan *παιδιά* performed by a *dikelistes* suggests mime rather than fully developed drama; and the scenes briefly covered under the captions "men stealing fruit" and "a foreign physician," with a quotation from a comedy of Alexis in the Middle period to illustrate what a foreign physician might say in such a *παιδιά*, may have been independent mimes rather than parts of a larger play. The bracketing of "men stealing fruit" with a foreign physician weakens the force of the passage for our purposes, but the physician as a character,³ the implied differentiation of foreign and native professional types, and the use of a passage of Middle comedy for illustrative purposes should at least arrest the

¹ Cf. von Salis, *de Doriensium ludorum in comoedia Att. vestigiis*, Basle, 1905.

² Cf. Thiele, *N. JHBB f. d. kl. Alt.*, IX (1902), 411 ff.

³ The passage of Alexis seems to point to the use of dialect, whether native or professional; a physician is generally supposed to be the speaker in Crates, frag. 41, and there uses Doric; cf. von Salis, *op. cit.*, 22 f.; the physician appears in late mimes according to Choricus V. 4 (*Rev. de phil.*, I [1877], 212).

attention of anybody who is searching for possible anticipations of the professional types of Hellenistic comedy in earlier dramatic forms. In harmony with this evidence of professional types and also of the discrimination of foreign and native rôles stands the statement regarding masks used in the farce of Peloponnesian Megara: a native and a foreign cook were provided with distinguishing masks and type-names, Maeson and Tettix.¹ Whether these and other professional types,² if there were such, were taken over by Epicharmus from his home in Peloponnesian Megara to his Sicilian habitat and there developed in a comedy of manners, we have no means of knowing. There is hardly valid evidence, but only a priori assumption that any plays of Epicharmus were comedies of types, of manners, of private life, such as we find in the Hellenistic period.

We must certainly beware of ascribing to Epicharmus any strict uniformity in the content and form of his dramatic poems;³ the general word "comedy" is improperly applied to them; some of them may have been mimes. Among these mimes probably belong the "debates," Γὰ καὶ Θάλασσα and Λόγος καὶ Λογίνα; these titles do not suggest anything more than a dramatized debate constituting the whole of a dramatic poem. We have no reason to suppose that the two debates were smaller parts of a larger drama and corresponded to the *agones* of Aristophanic comedy; such debates, however, might easily become parts of a larger whole, and one may properly find analogues, not in the *agones* of Aristophanic comedy, but in the

¹ For the evidence and discussion, cf. Kaibel 76; Schneidewin, *Coniect. crit.*, 120 ff.; Rankin, *The Rôle of the Mageiroi*, etc., 13 ff.; Robert, *Die Masken d. neuer. att. Komödie*, 12 ff., 71 ff. The comic effects secured by Cratinus in his *Odusses* may be due to a fusion of the *mageiros* and of the epic Cyclops (cf. Tanner, *Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc.*, XLVI [1915], 176).

² Modern scholars usually find the background of the professional types of Hellenistic comedy in corresponding figures in the episodic scenes of Aristophanic comedy. So far as professional rôles in later comedy are often inorganic, there is some analogy, but as regards the particular professional types employed, the cook, physician, and parasite of Doric farce and Epicharmus offer a more precise background than anything in Aristophanes. The passage of Athenaeus (659a) which seems to refer to Megarian farce the mask of the cook also mentions a mask of a *θεράπων*. The slave is too general a rôle to be used for discriminating varieties of comedy, though the Phluax-vases may provide evidence for Doric farce (von Salis, *op. cit.*, 23 ff.). It is the slave who makes comedy out of tragedy according to the prologue of the *Amphitruo*; it is interesting to find him emerging into the foreground in the later plays of Aristophanes; on his rôle in Old comedy cf. Zuretti, *Riv. di filol.*, XXXI (1903), 46 ff.

³ Cf. Thiele, *op. cit.*, 418, who argues more from titles than I should venture to do.

discussion between the two *Δόγαι* in the *Clouds* and in a faded form in the implied opposition of Wealth and Poverty in the *agon* of the *Plutus* (487 ff.).¹ Among these debates of Epicharmus there is no valid reason for including the *Ἑλπίς ἢ Πλοῦτος*; neither the title nor the fragments indicate the nature of the piece; from it are quoted the only fragments that may bear upon professional rôles in Epicharmus. These two fragments (34, 35) are spoken by a character whom Athenaeus (235e) describes in the words: "Carystus the Pergamene, in his work *Περὶ διδασκαλιῶν*, says that the parasite, as we now call him, was first invented by Alexis, forgetting that Epicharmus introduced him in his *Ἑλπίς ἢ Πλοῦτος*." Accepting the correction, we note again the *post hoc* in the combination of Epicharmus and Alexis corresponding to the quotation of Alexis in Athenaeus 621d to illustrate what the foreign physician in Doric farce might say.² In the second place we must observe that Athenaeus' statement implies that Epicharmus did not call the character a parasite;³ nor have we evidence that the parasite, under that name, existed in contemporary society. Thirdly, as regards technique, we should not overlook the fact that Athenaeus distinctly says that the character in speaking these verses was answering inquiries—that is, the speech was not in the form of monologue as corresponding speeches of parasites in Hellenistic comedy are likely to be; nor can we determine the

¹ Cf. the same opposition in Pherecrates' *Persai*. The debates in Epicharmus seem to me to be peculiarly rhetorical, as we might expect them to be in the home of rhetoric. The figures in the debate are abstract. The immediate issues and connections are to be found in the pastoral debate, in Callimachus' poem on the contest between the olive and the laurel, in the *Mortis et Vitae Iudicium* and *Cocus et Pistor*. The vigorous action and the live questions involved in Aristophanic *agones* might have developed, under the special conditions of Athenian life in the fifth century, from the placid debates of Epicharmus, but I should more easily admit a common origin of the two things than a development directly from mere debate into *agon*; such a common source might perhaps be found in the religious practices discussed by Usener, *Archiv f. Religionswiss.*, VII (1904), 297 ff., 313. Conceivably, *Luxuria* and *Inopia* in the prologue of Plautus' *Trinummus* are a much faded relic of the debate in Epicharmus, and abstractions like *Agnoia* and *Auxilium* in the prologues of New comedy may weakly reflect the interest of Epicharmus in allegorical figures instead of being merely casual variations of the usual *divinity-prologus*. Sieckmann's extravagant theory of the debate in Epicharmus (*de com. Att. primordiis*, Göttingen, 1906) is exploded by Süss, *BPW* (1907), 1377.

² On the general connection between Alexis and Epicharmus cf. Kaibel in *PWRE*, I, 1470.

³ But cf. Giese, *de parasiti persona* (Berlin, 1908), 5, n. 1.

organic relation of the speaker to the rest of the action. But with all these reservations the fragments which Athenaeus quotes, and especially frag. 35, put in the mouth of the speaker many of the stock themes of the later parasite, as ἄκλητος, γελωτοποιός, κόλαξ, and poverty-stricken, returning after the banquet besotted and unattended, mauled by the police, to his rough shake-down.¹ If the character in Epicharmus played only such a rôle as the parasitic slaves of Demos in Aristophanes' *Knights*, or the parasites of Eupolis' *Kolakes*, or of Aristophanes' *Tagenistai* he loses much of his significance for our present purpose, but in view of Aristotle's statement we are justified in pointing out the possible import of the two fragments.

The evidence of a comedy of manners in Sicily is not increased by consideration of the extant titles of Epicharmus' plays. One may often identify mythological comedy and the debate in Epicharmus by the title, but a supposition that the *Agrostinos* or the *Megaris*² is necessarily a comedy of private life can never with our present material be more than idle hypothesis. A vague argument from probability may be easily constructed by anybody who notes the obvious portrayal of private life in contemporary mimes of Sophron, or who cares to stress the scenes from private life often recognizable in the Phluax-vases of Southern Italy, assuming that these reflect a form of Doric farce which Epicharmus himself elaborated;³ and one may fairly observe that the Atellan play in Italy, with its obvious points of contact with Hellenistic comedy, is supposed by many modern scholars to have developed from the same elements of Doric farce which were incorporated in the Phluakes and embellished by

¹ For parallel themes in Hellenistic comedy, cf. Giese, *op. cit.*, 8, nn. 1, 2. That Crates frag. 3 was spoken by a parasite is merely an interesting guess, particularly interesting because the fragment is from the *Geitones*, in which (cf. below p. 420) Crates, after Epicharmus, exhibited drunkards on the stage. There is some general resemblance between Epich. frag. 35 and the epigram of Posidippus on the parasite which I have interpreted in *CP*, V (1910), 494 ff., so far as the difficulties of the homeward journey are concerned. For an extremely skeptical view of the evidence, cf. Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, 78, n. 1.

² Having no faith in titles as evidence, I refer to von Salis, *op. cit.*, 51 ff. for a list of titles which Epicharmus has in common with poets of later comedy.

³ The contrary view that the vases, being from the third century, illustrate a drama influenced by Hellenistic comedy would vitiate such evidence.

Epicharmus.¹ In general, it would facilitate our understanding of Hellenistic comedy and its background if we were in a position to prove that back of Epicharmus and of the Atellan play and of the Phluakes lay mythological and biological mimes which the Sicilian poet had developed from isolated or loosely connected scenes into coherent plays of manners and mythology, perhaps shorter in compass than the plays of either Old or New comedy. But of the mime in any early period it is difficult to recover clear traces, least of all to discern what relation it bore to the comedy, whether Dorian or Attic, which so often shows traits in common with it. Personally I find it difficult to regard as purely casual and accidental the transition which Athenaeus makes to his account of the beginnings of comedy, particularly of the mimic entertainments of the Spartan *dikelistes*. The whole passage, it will be remembered, is imbedded in an account of musical entertainments. Before passing to the *κωμική παιδιά* of the Spartan *dikelist*, as described by Sosibius, Athenaeus, discussing the musical mime, quotes Aristoxenus for the assertion that *τὴν μὲν ἰλαρωδίαν σεμνὴν οὖσαν παρὰ τὴν τραγωδίαν εἶναι, τὴν δὲ μαγωδίαν παρὰ τὴν κωμωδίαν*, and continues: *πολλάκις δὲ οἱ μαγῶδοι καὶ κωμικὰς ὑποθέσεις λαβόντες ὑποκρίθησαν κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀγωγὴν καὶ διάθεσιν*. Then briefly explaining the etymology of *μαγωδία*, he passes at once to the *κωμική παιδιά* of Sparta and ultimately to the heckling phallic chorus from which Aristotle derives Attic comedy. Magody is Ionic rather than Doric, but it is only a form of the pan-Hellenic mime and the rôles which the magodist assumed, *ὑποκρινόμενος ποτὲ μὲν γυναικας [καὶ] μοιχοὺς καὶ μαστροπούς, ποτὲ δὲ ἄνδρα μεθύοντα καὶ ἐπὶ κῶμον παραγινόμενον πρὸς τὴν ἐρωμένην* bring us into the range of characters and materials that would help much toward a reconstruction of the background of Hellenistic comedy, if we could once demonstrate that any of the plays of Epicharmus, contemporary of Sophron, were variously developed forms of the mime.² But as it is, the titles of Epicharmus' plays

¹ Cf. Marx, *PWRE*, s. v. Atellana.

² As Hiller has pointed out (*Rh. Mus.*, XXX [1875], 72) one should not hastily infer from Aristoxenus that magody developed later than the comedy with which it has characters and themes in common. The post-Christian remains of mime are always open to the charge of being influenced by comedy, but they read like popular, unliterary productions. The *certamen* between sailors on river boats and sailors on

lend greater plausibility to a theory of the influence of mythological than of biological mime.

With substantial evidence of a mythological comedy in Sicily and hardly more than vague surmisings of a comedy of manners we turn to Crates and Pherecrates. The scanty evidence of their dramatic work only negatively supports Aristotle's statement; the fragments are devoid of scurrilous attack; the titles are often non-committal, but they certainly suggest no emphasis upon mythological subject-matter and only by the incautious may they be used to demonstrate a comedy of manners. But outside the unknown and unknowable of titles and fragments there lies a tangible bit of evidence that seems to corroborate in a general way Aristotle's sharp discrimination of Crates' work from the less organic scurrilous comedy of the fifth century. In the notable document which Aristophanes gives us in the parabasis of the *Knights*, recounting the history of comedy down to his own day, the characterization of Crates, following the account of Magnes, with his interest in fantastic plays, and of Cratinus as the browbeater of contemporary wrongdoers, is highly significant in comparison with Aristotle's statement. Unfortunately Aristophanes' mysterious figurative language is as tantalizing as Aristotle's broad generalization; yet the two statements are, in a somewhat negative sense, harmonious. Crates, according to Aristophanes,¹ served a lunch to the audience at slight expense; he fashioned the neatest conceits in the driest style.² His reward was the wrath of the audience and hard knocks; yet *he* single-handed held his ground, sometimes failing, sometimes succeeding. Naturally

ocean-faring vessels, the opposition of sober man and drunkard, in late mimes are in spirit and form, though not in time, near the debates of Epicharmus (cf. the fifth edition of Crusius' Herondas 134-39). And the *Charition* (Crusius, *ibid.*, 101 ff.) should be more significant to any student of Hellenistic comedy than Euripides' *Iph. Taur.* and *Helena*.

¹ *οἷας δὲ Κράτης ὄργας ὑμῶν ἡνέσχετο καὶ στυφελίγμους, ὅς ἀπὸ μικρᾶς δαπάνης ὑμᾶς ἀριστίζων ἀπέπεμπεν, ἀπὸ κραμβοτάτου στόματος μάττων ἀστειοτάτας ἐπινοίας· χοῦτος μέντοι μόνος ἀντήρκει, τοτὲ μὲν πίπτων τοτὲ δ' οὐχί* [537-40].

² On the interpretation of *ἀπὸ κραμβοτάτου στόματος μάττων* I have no convictions, but whether the adjective is connected with *κράμβη*, of a plain fare, or with *κράμβος*, of a dry style, the phrase reinforces the meaning of *ἀριστίζων*; for various views, compare, not only the commentators, but Wilamowitz, *Antigonos von Karystos*, 96, and the recent suggestions discussed by Körte, *Burs.-Jahresb.*, CLII (1911), 293.

the interpretation of the passage is much disputed. A possible clue to the main thought is contained in Aristophanes frag. 333,¹ in which Crates is caricatured again for what we may suspect is an example of his "conceits" (cf. Crates frag. 29), and the adverb *ἀπόνως* seems to be applied with a suggestion of the slight outlay of intellectual effort which, from Aristophanes' standpoint, was expended by Crates in his comedies. To this meager mental expenditure, I think, Aristophanes refers in the "lunch at small expense" in the *Knights*. But that Aristophanes has in mind a tamer non-scurrilous comedy which, as compared with the virulent abuse in Cratinus, seems to him a lunch at slight expense is by no means clear; he may be referring only to such details of Crates' plays as he attacks in frag. 333, in which, apparently, a mere phrase or conceit of Crates is ironically handled in figurative language that is not unlike the figure employed in *Knights* 538.² The value, therefore, of the passage of the *Knights* lies, in my opinion, simply in the sharp differentiation of Crates from the other comic poets, not in the details of the description, which only by hasty and rash interpretation can be made to refer precisely to a non-scurrilous comedy.³

Outside of the *Knights* (and the scholia *ad loc.*, to which I shall refer later) only a scrap or two of external evidence remains, and that, again, is tantalizing. A recently discovered commentary on Aristophanes (*Papiri Greco-Egizii*, ii. 9) contains the words: (*πρῶτος δ*) ἐὶ δὲ Κράτ(η)ς (ε)ισή(γαγεν), then a gap, and *καπηλίδων* in the next sentence. This may have ascribed to Crates the introduction of characters like the *καπηλίδες*, and the general drift may have loosely corresponded to the assertion in an anonymous writer on comedy

¹ The text of the fragment (cf. Kaibel's *Athenaeus* 117c) is unintelligible in part, though the general meaning is clear. Comedy is represented, ironically, as furnishing *μέγα βρῶμα* at the time of Crates; and the diet supplied by Comedy in his time is illustrated by *τάριχος ἐλεφάντινον*, the whimsical phrase of Crates.

² The resemblance lies between the lunch in the *Knights* and the *μέγα βρῶμα* furnished by Comedy according to the ironic statement of the fragment.

³ I admit, of course, that with Aristotle's statement in mind one easily yields to the temptation of pressing the meaning of the passage of the *Knights*, but in view of frag. 333 I think that it is in the interest of conservative interpretation to avoid such large inferences as Neil, *ad loc.*, draws in saying that Crates represents "a foreshadowing of the New comedy" and that "*δορεῖος* would especially suit the Athenian Terence."

(Kaibel, 7/30), who says of Crates: *καὶ πρῶτος μεθύοντας ἐν κωμῳδίᾳ παρήγαγεν*. The same fact is reported in Athenaeus (429a), who in a trivial discussion of the use of drunkards in the drama, after contending that Aeschylus, not Euripides, *πρῶτος . . . παρήγαγε τὴν τῶν μεθύοντων ὄψιν εἰς τραγωδίαν*, continues: *ἀγνοοῦσὶ τε οἱ λέγοντες πρῶτον Ἐπίχαρμον ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνὴν παραγαγεῖν μεθύοντα, μεθ' ὃν Κράτεια ἐν Γείτοσι*. Quite apart from the validity of such accounts of *εὐρήματα*, the use of drunkards does not necessarily point to any specific type of comedy, but we may at least observe in Athenaeus the *post hoc* that again binds Epicharmus and Crates; it is not, however, stated as a *propter hoc*.¹

Passing to internal evidence, we find that neither the titles nor the fragments of Crates' and Pherecrates' plays have more than negative value. The statement of Suidas regarding Crates that there were two poets of the name attaches some doubt to the authorship of the titles and fragments referred to him. Clearly, however, neither Aristophanes nor Aristotle was conscious of any ambiguity in referring to Crates. Of the *Thesauros* and the *Philarguros*, titles which seem to some indicative of a comedy of manners, we have no fragments. Meineke,² judging from the titles, immediately denies the authorship of Crates, and ascribes the plays to the period of Middle or New comedy, a rather singular procedure in view of Aristotle's statement. But only a hasty critic will argue much from such titles. Plays with the title *Thesauros*, to be sure, were written by half a dozen Hellenistic poets, and Philemon's play of that name was the model of Plautus' *Trinummus*. Certainly *Philarguros* would be a fitting title for a character comedy such as suggested Plautus' *Aulularia*. But Crates' *Thesauros* may in plot have more nearly resembled Aristophanes' *Plutus* (in this case, perhaps, of some interest as an example of the type of Middle comedy), and we cannot deny that *φιλάργυρος* may mean "grafter" as well as "miser," and that the play was as likely to be a scurrilous satire as a character comedy.³ These possibilities I mention simply to justify my refusal

¹ The evidence clearly does not warrant any suggestion of connection between the drunkards in Crates' plays and the *κῶμος μεθύοντων* of Menander.

² *FCG*, I, 64.

³ The rôle played by *Thesauros* in Lucian's *Timon* (compared with Antiphanes' *Timon*) strengthens the suggestion that Crates' *Thesauros* might have resembled the

to argue from titles alone. Of mythological comedy, which is the most completely authenticated material of Epicharmus' plays, Crates has no clear trace save in the title *Dionusos*. Little can safely be argued of the content of the plays from the fragments; the *Theria* presented a picture of Schlaraffenland in which the table set itself, wine poured itself, and the like. This may have been social satire rather than personal abuse; if so, one may well note that such a type of comedy might fall within the range of Aristotle's reference to generalized comedy. Such criticism of social conditions, as distinguished from personal abuse, is more fully suggested by the titles of Pherecrates' plays; frag. 155 proves that this poet was not entirely averse to personal attack, but otherwise the fragments contain no personal criticism. Titles like *Agrioi*, *Metalles*, *Krapataloi*, *Murmekanthropoi*, in combination with fragments and external evidence, point to an interest in Utopian sociological comedy. *Anthropherakles*, *Pseudheracles*, *Cheiron* might have been mythological. Tantalizing possibilities of a comedy of manners are contained in three titles, *Ἐπιλήσμων ἢ Θάλαττα*, *Korianno*, *Petale*; for there is some reason to think that Korianno, and possibly Thalatta and Petale, were names of courtezans.¹

Baffling as the search is for positive confirmation of the facts expressed in Aristotle's statement, I think that we may safely say that his characterization of Crates was part of a larger and consistent theory which found in Sicilian comedy, and in occasional imitations of it in Athens in the fifth century, a substantial foreshadowing of Hellenistic comedy. The scholia on the passage of the *Knights* already discussed are the usual mass of error, idle fancy, and possible fact. One of them, erroneously referring to Crates as a tragic poet,

Plutus in a general way rather than any such play as Philemon wrote. On *φιλάργυρος* in the sense of "grafter" cf. Platonius' account of comedy (Kaibel 3/8), where *φιλάργυροι* is obviously covered by the *χρήματα συλλέγουσιν ἐξ ἀδικίας* of Kaibel 5/49.

¹ The evidence in the case of Thalatta and Petale is hardly valid, that for Korianno is more substantial; cf. Meineke, *FCG*, I, 82, 83, 86 n. 29. The bibulous women, the quarrel of father and son, both perhaps in love with the same courtesan, are suggestive details in the *Korianno*. That Anaxandrides (Suidas s.v.) was the first to introduce into comedy *ἔρωτας καὶ παρθένων φθοράς* is contradicted by what is reported of Aristophanes' *Kokalos* and, in general, statements in which *εἰρήματα* are ascribed to Hellenistic comic poets only substantiate the frequent recurrence in their plays of certain characters and themes. On the *Agrioi* cf. Hoffmann, *Ad antiq. com. historiam symbolae*, Berlin, 1910.

ascribes to him *ὀλιγόστιχα ποιήματα*, and another begins *σμικρὰ ἐποίει*. . . . These references to the smaller compass of Crates' productions may be idle inferences from the "lunch at small expense" in the text of Aristophanes,¹ but a play without a chorus or with a relatively inactive chorus would naturally be appreciably shorter than the normal play of Aristophanes. The concluding sentence, however, of the second scholium is worthy of more serious attention. It will be remembered that Aristophanes in the text distinctly says that Crates endured the anger of the audience and rough knocks at the hands of the spectators, though the younger poet admits that occasional success in the dramatic competition rewarded Crates' efforts. This second scholium is sufficiently at variance with Aristophanes' statement to warrant an inference that the scholiast has information other than that furnished by Aristophanes; the scholium reads: *σμικρὰ ἐποίει καὶ ἔτερπε τοὺς ἀκροατάς, γράφων ἡδέα*. Aristophanes has certainly not emphasized the entertainment furnished the audience by Crates. Now in a familiar passage of Aristotle's *Ethics* (1128a) the philosopher distinguishes buffoonery from true wit:² the buffoon aims only to excite laughter rather than to say what is seemly and to avoid paining the object of his ridicule. Later Aristotle illustrates the difference by an appeal to the Old and the New comedies, meaning by the latter what we call the Middle comedy, and expresses the thought which underlies the ancient theory of comedy found in the late Greek documents summarized above, viz.; that Old comedy found *τὸ γελοῖον* in *αἰσχρολογία*, New (Middle) comedy in *ὑπόνοια*. He then raises the question how we are to define seemly jesting in these words: *πότερον οὖν τὸν εὖ σκώπτοντα ὀριστείον τῷ λέγειν μὴ ἀπρεπῇ ἐλευθερίῳ, ἢ τῷ μὴ λυπεῖν τὸν ἀκούοντα ἢ καὶ τέρπειν; ἢ καὶ τὸ γε τοιοῦτον ἀόριστον; ἄλλο γὰρ ἄλλω μισητόν τε καὶ ἡδύ*. The sharp antithesis between *τὸ λυπεῖν* and *τὸ τέρπειν*, as coterminous with the differentiation between *αἰσχρολογία*

¹ The *Liber Glossarum* (Kaibel, 72/14) ascribes to the earliest writers of Old comedy plays not over 300 verses in length, a statement that is discredited by Kaibel, "Die Prolegomena," 46, n. 1 and exploited by Sieckmann, *op. cit.*, 24, as harmonizing with Birt's conjectural estimate of the length of Epicharmus' plays.

² Cornford, *The Origin of Attic Comedy*, 218 n. 1, briefly notes the relation between the two passages (and Evanthius, quoted above), but Hendrickson, in dealing with Roman satire, had already made full use of the relevant material; cf. *AJP*, XV (1894), 1 ff; XXI (1900), 121 ff; especially XV (1894), 25 and nn. 1, 2.

and *ὑπόνοια*, and between Old and Middle comedy warrants us, I think, in suspecting that the scholiast on the *Knights* in his strange emphasis on *ἐτερπε* and *ἡδέα* is dependent upon just such a differentiation of Old and Middle comedy as Aristotle makes, and by referring to Crates as interested primarily in *τὸ τέρπειν* the scholiast may be echoing part of a fuller discussion of the matter by Aristotle in which not only was Middle comedy differentiated from the Old in the terms of the *Ethics*, but Crates was represented as anticipating the Middle comedy in the terms of the *Poetics*.

This theory seems to emerge in other ancient documents. An anonymous writer on comedy (Kaibel 7/28-8/35) agrees with Aristotle in ascribing non-scurrilous comedy to Crates and adds Pherecrates to the list. In describing Crates he uses the phrase *πάνν γελοῖος καὶ ἱλαρὸς γενόμενος*. The adjective *ἱλαρός* is in implied antithesis to *αἰσθηρός*, *πικρός*, and the like, descriptive of the normal poets of Old comedy. This particular antithesis is prominent in the Latin documents, which, we have already remarked, offer a more reasonable statement of Greek theory than the Greek documents, when they come to differentiate the New comedy from the Old. So in the *Liber Glossarum* (Kaibel 72/15) the adjective *ἱλαρός* applied to Crates is recalled in the sentence: "postea autem ommissa maledicendi libertate privatorum hominum vitam *cum hilaritate* imitabantur, admonentes quid adpetendum quidve cavendum esset." And *ἡδέα γράφων* applied to Crates by the scholiast on the *Knights* is recalled when we observe the sharp antithesis between the bitter and the sweet of the Old and the New comedy, respectively, in such statements as Diomedes makes (Kaibel 58/165): "secunda aetate fuerunt Aristophanes, Eupolis et Cratinus, qui et principum vitia sectati *acerbissimas* comoedias composuerunt. tertia aetas fuit Menandri, Diphili et Philemonis, qui *omnem acerbiteratem* comoediae *mitigaverunt*. . . ." And so Evanthius (Kaibel 64/70) distinguishes New comedy as the type "quae . . . minus *amaritudinis* spectatoribus et eadem opera *multum delectationis* afferret." Through all such commentary runs the Aristotelian antithesis of *λυπεῖν* and *τέρπειν*, of (*πικρός*) and *ἡδύς* as coterminous with the *λοιδορία* and the *ὑπόνοια* of Old and Hellenistic comedy, and the characterization of Crates is an inherent part of this theory.

The theory as theory therefore can be substantially rehabilitated; the value which we attach to it will accord with our estimate of Aristotle's worth as a literary critic. It will, however, still be impossible to confirm either the facts or the theory from the material evidence supplied by our extant remains of Sicilian comedy and of Crates. From this evidence the only conservative inference, if we attach any value to Aristotle's statement, may be best expressed in Wilamowitz' discreet comment:¹ "Um die Entwicklung des Aristophanes und der Komödie überhaupt zu beurteilen, müssten wir eine mythologische Travestie und ein Stück des Pherekrates, wie die *Korianno*, kennen: so ist es bitter, aber unvermeidlich, dass wir resignieren." This passive state of resignation, however, may well become one of positive opposition if modern students of Roman comedy, minimizing this tantalizing evidence of a generalized comedy developing under Sicilian influence in the hands of Crates and Pherecrates in the fifth century, proceed to construct a theory in which Hellenistic comedy appears largely as an issue from Euripidean tragedy.² For weak as the links may be that connect Epicharmus, Crates, and Pherecrates with Hellenistic comedy, they are at

¹ *Sitzb. d. berlin. Akad.* (1911), 485.

² Very reluctantly, in the pages above, I have briefly resumed the evidence of ancient theory, without expecting to add much to the discussion. The proper appreciation, however, of the Euripidean theory seemed to me impossible without once more surveying, I hope conservatively, the opposing view of ancient critics and distinguishing two versions of ancient dogma. The emphasis upon political conditions in one version may be old, as a comparison of Platonius (Kaibel 3/9 ff.) with Ps. Xenoph. *de rep. Ath.* II. 18 suggests; and the aesthetic version does not necessarily exclude the main elements of the political theory. Yet my main interest is not in any precise determination of sources, but in sketching the outlines of an Aristotelian theory in which Old and Middle comedy are sharply differentiated, with proper provision for foreshadowings of the Middle comedy even in the fifth century, and these foreshadowings not primarily in the aggressive triad, Cratinus, Eupolis, and Aristophanes. Very likely, if we had all the material of comedy before us, we might not accept this Aristotelian theory, for modern procedure, in explaining the development of literary types, is more exact than ancient theory; but it is none the less important to note that, with the exception of a single document to be discussed later, ancient theory that is substantially due to Aristotle has found no place for Euripides in accounting for the development of comedy down to at least the middle of the fourth century.

In a brief survey, written simply as preliminary to a discussion of the Euripidean theory, a full bibliography of the treatment by modern scholars of Sicilian-Attic comedy is out of place. A detailed examination of the question may be expected in a Princeton dissertation, as yet unpublished, entitled *The Transition from Old to Middle Comedy*. Older handbooks of Greek literature, as, for example, Bergk-Peppmueller, followed Aristotle's clue, often exaggerating the value of the evidence. Welcker in his study

least sufficient to induce a sober conservative attitude toward any exclusive emphasis upon Euripidean tragedy, or upon a combination of scurrilous comedy and Euripidean tragedy, as the dominant force in the generation of later comedy. The vogue of the modern theory, however, requires a serious consideration of the bases upon which it rests.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[To be concluded]

of Epicharmus in *Kleine Schriften* did not hesitate to emphasize the value of Sicilian-Attic comedy. Hasper devoted a loosely written programme (*De Cratete et Pherecrate nov. com. praecursoribus* [Leipzig, 1877]) to the subject. Zielinski, *Die Gliederung d. altatt. Komödie*, 242, endeavored to discriminate a Dorian, mythological, ethico-social, from an Ionic, political-personal, or elfish, comedy. Süß, in his dissertation *De personarum ant. com. Att. usu atque origine* (Bonn, 1905), saw the significance of Crates and Pherecrates, but in *Rh. Mus.*, LXV (1910), 441 ff. emphasized the value of Aristophanes as foreshadowing Hellenistic comedy. The most recent statements of the case by Körte represent the germs of mythological and realistic comedy as existing in Sicilian comedy; he appreciates the importance of Crates and Pherecrates; nor does he fail to emphasize the influence of Euripides though regarding it as setting in late and gradually increasing; cf. *Hermes*, XXXIX (1904), 486, 490; *Burs.-Jahresb.*, CLII (1911), 233, 244, 258; and his popular essay *Die griech. Komödie* (1914), pp. 24 ff., 68 ff. The effect of Leo's studies in Roman comedy is apparent in most of the recent handbooks of Greek literature, as in Christ-Schmid I*, 400, in which the influence of the Sicilian comedy of types on Old comedy, particularly on Crates, and then upon Middle and New comedy, it is remarked, "kann zuversichtlich angenommen werden," and "the same influence is probably effective upon the Atellan play"; the force of "zuversichtlich" can be estimated by the full statement of Euripidean influence in the same handbook, II/1*, 26 ff.